

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/985,734

Applicant(s)

HAALA, CATHERINE A.

Examiner

Ronald Baum

Art Unit

2136

**All Participants:**(1) Ronald Baum.(2) Dinesh Agarwal.**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 15 September 2004**Time:** 16:10**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic



Video Conference

Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.****Rejection(s) discussed:***Appeal Brief of 16 June 2004***Claims discussed:**

1,2

**Prior art documents discussed:***na***Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:***See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon examiner reconsideration of applicants prior arguments in the remarks of 6/10/2004, discussed how claim 1 requires additional element from claim 2 dealing with "further obstructing the person..." (i.e., subsequent obstruction after the first obstruction). The examiner proposed appropriate changes via examiner amendment, into claim 1 (adding claim 2 element to claim 1 language, and modifying reference in claim 3 to now reference claim 1 instead of claim 2) that would sufficiently narrow the scope and distinguish the invention for allowance. Mr. Agarwal obtained the approval of the applicant and stipulated that the applicant may file a continuation for the broader claim(s).